

MAN

FILED

JUN 10 2008

NF

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

**MICHAEL W. DOBBINS
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT**

WILLIE BROWN,Plaintiff in *Pro se*,

- vs -

**VILLAGE OF ROMEOVILLE,
ET. AL.,**

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

08 CV 1577**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Judge James F. Holderman

Magistrate Judge Martin C. Ashman

**PLAINTIFF'S FRCP RULE 6(b)(1) MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
OF TIME TO FILE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Introduction:

The Plaintiff, **WILLIE BROWN** ("Brown") brings forth this frcp rule 6(b)(1) motion to enlargement of time to file first amended complaint, *pro se*, seeking to have this court to allow an additional thirty-eight (38) days or until the 19th day of July, 2008, in order for plaintiff Brown to submit the verified first amended complaint.

Background:

On or about the 18th day of March, 2008, plaintiff Brown filed his original complaint containing a reservation of rights clause indicating that his investigation was ongoing and that he reserved the right to add additional claims and additional defendants should his investigation so merit (See page 26 of the original verified complaint).

On or about the 5th day of May 2008, as a means to conduct further investigation for adding additional claims and naming additional defendants. Plaintiff Brown submitted his first set of interrogatories and first set of request for production of documents to the defendants with a response due date of the 6th of June, 2008.

After plaintiff Brown submitted a written reminder to the defendants' counsel about the

due date for tendering over response to the various discovery requests. Rather than submitting the discovery responses, the defendants' counsel submitted plaintiff Brown a letter indicating he required an additional twenty-one (21) days or until June 30, 2008 in order to respond to the various discovery request. Then, on or about the the 23rd day of May, 2008, the defendants' counsel submitted his deposition notice and request for production of documents. The defendants' request for production of documents essentially seeks to acquire documents already attached to the original verified complaint, and seeks to acquire documents sought to be acquired from the defendants.

During the most recent status hearing held on the 29th day of May, 2008, this court granted plaintiff Brown's in open court request for leave to file the first amended complaint allowing until the 10th day of June, 2008 for the filing of the first amended complaint.

Argument:

Plaintiff Brown contends that this court should grant this frcp rule 6(b)(1) motion for enlargement of time and allow an additional thirty-eight (38) days or until the 19th day of July, 2008, in order for the verified first amended compalint to be filed for the following reason which will serve as a complete bases for granting this motion and for allowing an additional thirty-eight (38) days or until the 19th day of July, 2008 in order for the verified first amended complaint to be filed.

Based upon the defendants' stalling until the 30th day of June, 2008 in order to tender over responses to the investigatory discovery requests. Plaintiff Brown is unable to complete the drafting of his verified first amended complaint to include his additional claims and to properly add additional defendants by the June 10, 2008 due date. The

responses to plaintiff Brown's discovery requests are needed for assisting with his effort to identify the additional claims and additional defendants to be added in the verified first amended complaint. After the defendants tender over responses to the various discovery requests by their selected June 30, 2008 date. Then, plaintiff Brown will require approximately nine (9) days of study time and nine (9) days to complete the drafting of the verified first amended complaint.

This motion is not being interposed for an improper purpose such as to delay these proceedings. But rather, this motion is being interposed for the purpose of ensuring that all viable claims receive adjudication by this court. Therefore, this court should grant this frcp rule 6(b)(1) motion and allow plaintiff Brown an additional twenty-eight (28) days or until the 19th day of July, 2008, in order to submit the verified first amended complaint.

Conclusion:

Based upon the agrument set forth above, the fairest and just decision for this Honorable Court to issue would be to grant this frcp rule 6(b)(1) motion for enlargment of time. Granting this motion will serve the ends of justice, and will not prejudice any party.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, **WILLIE BROWN** ("Brown") respectfully request that this court to issue a decision consistent with the argument set forth in this frcp rule 6(b)(1) motion for enlargement of time.

Respectfully submitted

By 
WILLIE BROWN
Plaintiff in *Pro se*

Willie Brown
601 Theodore Street
Joliet, Illinois 60435
(815) 740-1467